UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,395	09/28/2001	Amy L. Sherwood	BS01-175	2346

28970 7590 03/09/2006

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER	
SKED, MATTHEW J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2655	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/964,395	SHERWOOD, AMY L.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew J. Sked	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 January 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/09/06 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 19, 21, 22, 24, 30, 31, 33, 35-38, 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,535,848) in view of Jambhekar et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,430,405).

As per claims 1 and 18, Ortega teaches a system for transcribing a recorded message, the system comprising:

a storing device for storing a recorded message for a recipient of the recorded message, for playing back the recorded message to the recipient in response to the recipient attempting access to the recorded message (stores the speech in a memory device, col. 4, lines 48-51);

for prompting the recipient to select an action to be performed for the recorded message after the recorded message has been played back and in response to the recipient attempting to access the recorded message (user is given the option to preview the message and following the preview the user would be prompted to select to transcribe, preview the audio again or cancel, col. 9, lines 14-15, 33-44 and Fig. 6, elements 608 and 612);

receiving a selection from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message in response to the prompt (user selects the transcribe option, col. 10, line 65 to col. 11, line 4);

a transcription device, in communication with the storing device, for transcribing a recorded message into a computer file upon the storage device receiving the selection from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message (transcription computer accesses the multiple recorded speech files from storage, col. 3, lines 20-29); and

an archival device, in communication with the transcription device, for reading the computer file and outputting or storing a transcribed version of the recorded message (stores a textual representation of the converted phrases, col. 11, lines 29-34).

Ortega does not teach a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it.

Jambhekar teaches a system for sending messages to multiple archival devices that allows the user to assign numeric options to the multiple archival devices for selection (Fig. 6-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it as taught by Jambhekar because it would give an easy to use interface that would allow the recipient to choose an appropriate device to send the message.

5. As per claims 2 and 19, Ortega does not teach the storing device is a voicemail system.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is a messaging service (col. 2,lines 28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega so the storing device is a voicemail system as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the system to be incorporated in a telephonic system hence making the system more marketable.

6. As per claims 4 and 21, Ortega teaches the transcription device is an integral part of the storing device (transcription and recording device could be directly linked, col. 3, lines 36-40).

7. As per claims 5, 7, 22 and 24, Ortega does not teach the archival device to be email or a facsimile machine.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is e-mail or fax (col. 2,lines 28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have the archival device be email or a facsimile machine as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the transcription to be sent to a remote user hence facilitating use.

8. As per claim 8, Ortega teaches a system for transcribing a recorded message, the system comprising:

a storing device for storing a recorded message for a recipient of the recorded message, for playing back the recorded message to the recipient in response to the recipient attempting access to the recorded message (stores the speech in a memory device, col. 4, lines 48-51);

for prompting the recipient to select an action to be performed for the recorded message after the recorded message has been played back and in response to the recipient attempting to access the recorded message (user is given the option to preview the message and following the preview the user would be prompted to select to transcribe, preview the audio again or cancel, col. 9, lines 14-15, 33-44 and Fig. 6, elements 608 and 612);

receiving a selection from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message in response to the prompt (user selects the transcribe option, col. 10, line 65 to col. 11, line 4);

a transcription device, in communication with the storing device, for transcribing a recorded message into a computer file upon the storage device receiving the selection from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message (transcription computer accesses the multiple recorded speech files from storage, col. 3, lines 20-29); and

an archival device, in communication with the transcription device, for reading the computer file and outputting or storing a transcribed version of the recorded message (stores a textual representation of the converted phrases, col. 11, lines 29-34).

Ortega does not teach a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it.

Jambhekar teaches a system for sending messages to multiple archival devices that allows the user to assign numeric options to the multiple archival devices for selection (Fig. 6-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it as taught by Jambhekar because it would give an easy to use interface that would allow the recipient to choose an appropriate device to send the message.

Ortega does not teach the storing device is a voicemail system.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is a messaging service (col. 2,lines 28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega so the storing device is a voicemail system as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the system to be incorporated in a telephonic system hence making the system more marketable.

9. As per claim 9, Ortega teaches the transcription device is an integral part of the storing device (transcription and recording device could be directly linked, col. 3, lines 36-40).

10. As per claim 30, Ortega teaches a method of transcribing a recorded message, the method comprising:

accessing, by a recipient, a storing device storing a recorded message for the recipient to thereby access the recorded message (selects files to transcribe from memory, col. 7, lines 20-31);

listening, by the recipient, to the recorded message (user previews the message, Fig. 6, element 612); and

in response to accessing the listening to the recorded message, responding, by the recipient, to a prompt for an action for the recorded message by indicating that the recorded message should be transcribed (user is given the option to preview the message and following the preview the user would be prompted to select to transcribe,

preview the audio again or cancel, col. 9, lines 14-15, 33-44 and Fig. 6, elements 608 and 612).

Ortega does not teach a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it.

Jambhekar teaches a system for sending messages to multiple archival devices that allows the user to assign numeric options to the multiple archival devices for selection (Fig. 6-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it as taught by Jambhekar because it would give an easy to use interface that would allow the recipient to choose an appropriate device to send the message.

11. As per claim 31, Ortega does not teach the storing device is a voicemail system.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is a messaging service (col. 2,lines 28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega so the storing device is a voicemail system as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the system to be incorporated in a telephonic system hence making the system more marketable.

12. As per claims 33, 35 and 36, Ortega does not teach the archival device to be email or a facsimile machine.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is e-mail or fax (col. 2,lines 28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have the archival device be email or a facsimile machine as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the transcription to be sent to a remote user hence facilitating use.

13. As per claim 37, Ortega teaches a method of transcribing a recorded message, the method comprising:

accessing, by a recipient, a storing device storing a recorded message for the recipient to thereby access the recorded message (selects files to transcribe from memory, col. 7, lines 20-31);

listening, by the recipient, to the recorded message (user previews the message, Fig. 6, element 612); and

in response to accessing the listening to the recorded message, responding, by the recipient, to a prompt for an action for the recorded message by indicating that the recorded message should be transcribed (user is given the option to preview the message and following the preview the user would be prompted to select to transcribe, preview the audio again or cancel, col. 9, lines 14-15, 33-44 and Fig. 6, elements 608 and 612).

Ortega does not teach a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it.

Jambhekar teaches a system for sending messages to multiple archival devices that allows the user to assign numeric options to the multiple archival devices for selection (Fig. 6-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it as taught by Jambhekar because it would give an easy to use interface that would allow the recipient to choose an appropriate device to send the message.

Ortega does not teach the storing device is a voicemail system.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is a messaging service (col. 2,lines 28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega so the storing device is a voicemail system as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the system to be incorporated in a telephonic system hence making the system more marketable.

14. As per claims 38, 40 and 41, Ortega does not teach the archival device to be email or a facsimile machine.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is e-mail or fax (col. 2,lines 28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have the archival device be email or a facsimile machine as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the transcription to be sent to a remote user hence facilitating use.

15. Claims 3, 6, 20, 23, 32, 34 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Jambhekar and taken in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

As per claims 3, 20 and 32, Ortega and Jambhekar do not teach the storing device is a telephone answering machine.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches that the use of telephone answering machines is well known in transcription.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega and Jambhekar to have the storage device be a telephone answering machine, the precursor of voicemail, because it would allow the system to operate for users still without voicemail, hence making it more marketable.

16. As per claims 6, 23, 34 and 39, Ortega and Jambhekar do not teach the archival device to be a printer.

Applicant's admitted prior art that printers are a well known output device in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega and Jambhekar to have the archival device be

a printer because it would give a hard copy transcription of the voice message hence facilitating use for the user.

17. Claims 10, 11, 13-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,535,848) in view of Jambhekar et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,430,405) and taken in further view of Padmanabhan et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,219,638).

As per claim 10, Ortega teaches a system for transcribing a recorded message, the system comprising:

a storing device for storing a recorded message for a recipient of the recorded message, for playing back the recorded message to the recipient in response to the recipient attempting access to the recorded message (stores the speech in a memory device, col. 4, lines 48-51);

for prompting the recipient to select an action to be performed for the recorded message after the recorded message has been played back and in response to the recipient attempting to access the recorded message (user is given the option to preview the message and following the preview the user would be prompted to select to transcribe, preview the audio again or cancel, col. 9, lines 14-15, 33-44 and Fig. 6, elements 608 and 612);

receiving a selection from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message in response to the prompt (user selects the transcribe option, col. 10, line 65 to col. 11, line 4);

a transcription device, in communication with the storing device, for transcribing a recorded message into a computer file upon the storage device receiving the selection from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message (transcription computer accesses the multiple recorded speech files from storage, col. 3, lines 20-29); and

an archival device, in communication with the transcription device, for reading the computer file and outputting or storing a transcribed version of the recorded message (stores a textual representation of the converted phrases, col. 11, lines 29-34).

Ortega does not teach a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it.

Jambhekar teaches a system for sending messages to multiple archival devices that allows the user to assign numeric options to the multiple archival devices for selection (Fig. 6-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it as taught by Jambhekar because it would give an easy to use interface that would allow the recipient to choose an appropriate device to send the message.

Ortega and Jambhekar do not teach a converting device for converting the text file to different formats that are recognized by different recording devices and a plurality of archival devices, each archival device in communication with the converting device

and capable or reading a recognized format of the text file and outputting or storing a transcribed version of the recorded message.

Padmanabhan teaches a converting device for converting the text file to at least one of different formats that are recognized by different recording devices (sends the data via email, fax or page hence it must inherently have a converting device to change between these formats, col. 4, lines 62-67); and

a plurality of archival devices, each archival device in communication with the converting device and capable or reading a recognized format of the text file and outputting or storing a transcribed version of the recorded message (sends the data via email, fax or pager, col. 4, lines 62-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system to modify the system of Ortega and Jambhekar to have a converting device for converting the text file to different formats that are recognized by different recording devices and a plurality of archival devices, each archival device in communication with the converting device and capable or reading a recognized format of the text file and outputting or storing a transcribed version of the recorded message as taught by Padmanabhan because this would allow the transcription system to operate with multiple well known text based devices hence making the system more versatile.

18. As per claim 11, Ortega does not teach the storing device is a voicemail system.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is a messaging service (col. 2,lines 28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega so the storing device is a voicemail system as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the system to be incorporated in a telephonic system hence making the system more marketable.

19. As per claim 13, Ortega teaches the transcription device is an integral part of the storing device (transcription and recording device could be directly linked, col. 3, lines 36-40).

20. As per claim 14, Ortega and Jambhekar do not teach the converting device is an integral part of the storing device.

Padmanabhan teaches the converting device is an integral part of the storing device (message server is connected with the speech recognition server through the telephony server, col. 4, lines 62-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega and Jambhekar so the converting device is an integral part of the storing device as taught by Padmanabhan because it would ensure the data would not have to be transmitted hence saving processing time.

21. As per claims 15 and 17, Ortega does not teach the archival device to be email or a facsimile machine.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is e-mail or fax (col. 2,lines 28-33).
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have the archival device be email or a facsimile machine

as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the transcription to be sent to a remote user hence facilitating use.

22. Claims 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Jambhekar and taken in view of Padmanabhan and Applicant's admitted prior art.

As per claims 12, Ortega, Jambhekar and Padmanabhan do not teach the storing device is a telephone answering machine.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches that the use of telephone answering machines is well known in transcription.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega, Jambhekar and Padmanabhan to have the storage device be a telephone answering machine, the precursor of voicemail, because it would allow the system to operate for users still without voicemail, hence making it more marketable.

23. As per claims 16, Ortega, Jambhekar and Padmanabhan do not teach the archival device to be a printer.

Applicant's admitted prior art that printers are a well known output device in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega, Jambhekar and Padmanabhan to have the

archival device be a printer because it would give a hard copy transcription of the voice message hence facilitating use for the user.

24. Claims 25-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Jambhekar and taken in further view of Padmanabhan and Damiba et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0169605A1).

As per claim 25, Ortega teaches a system for transcribing a recorded message, the system comprising:

a storing device for storing a recorded message for a recipient of the recorded message, for playing back the recorded message to the recipient in response to the recipient attempting access to the recorded message (stores the speech in a memory device, col. 4, lines 48-51);

for prompting the recipient to select an action to be performed for the recorded message after the recorded message has been played back and in response to the recipient attempting to access the recorded message (user is given the option to preview the message and following the preview the user would be prompted to select to transcribe, preview the audio again or cancel, col. 9, lines 14-15, 33-44 and Fig. 6, elements 608 and 612);

receiving a selection from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message in response to the prompt (user selects the transcribe option, col. 10, line 65 to col. 11, line 4);

a transcription device, in communication with the storing device, for transcribing a recorded message into a computer file upon the storage device receiving the selection from the recipient to transcribe the recorded message (transcription computer accesses the multiple recorded speech files from storage, col. 3, lines 20-29); and

an archival device, in communication with the transcription device, for reading the computer file and outputting or storing a transcribed version of the recorded message (stores a textual representation of the converted phrases, col. 11, lines 29-34).

Ortega does not teach a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it.

Jambhekar teaches a system for sending messages to multiple archival devices that allows the user to assign numeric options to the multiple archival devices for selection (Fig. 6-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have a plurality of archival devices assigned to recipient designated numeric options stored in a memory thus allowing the recipient to select the numeric option corresponding to the archival device in order to select it as taught by Jambhekar because it would give an easy to use interface that would allow the recipient to choose an appropriate device to send the message.

Ortega and Jambhekar do not teach a converting device, in communication with the transcription device, for converting the transcribed message into a format that is readable by an archival device.

Padmanabhan teaches a converting device, in communication with the transcription device, for converting the transcribed message into a format that is readable by an archival device (sends the data via email, fax or page hence it must inherently have a converting device to change between these formats, col. 4, lines 62-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system to modify the system of Ortega and Jambhekar to have a converting device, in communication with the transcription device, for converting the transcribed message into a format that is readable by an archival device as taught by Padmanabhan because this would allow the transcription system to operate with multiple well known text based devices hence making the system more versatile.

Ortega, Jambhekar and Padmanabhan do not teach the system being portable and having a port, in communication with the converting device and an archival device, for allowing output of the converted transcribed message to the archival device for output or storage thereon.

Damiba teaches a speech-to-text system that is portable (plug-and-play capabilities, paragraph 18) and having a port to communicate with exterior devices (3rd party service adapter, paragraph 86).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega, Jambhekar and Padmanabhan to make the system portable with a port as taught by Damiba for communication with the converting device and an archival device, for allowing output of the converted transcribed message

to the archival device for output or storage thereon because it would give more functionality hence making the system more flexible.

25. As per claim 26, Ortega teaches the transcription device is an integral part of the storing device (transcription and recording device could be directly linked, col. 3, lines 36-40).

26. As per claims 27 and 29, Ortega does not teach the archival device to be email or a facsimile machine.

Jambhekar teaches the storing device is e-mail or fax (col. 2,lines 28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega to have the archival device be email or a facsimile machine as taught by Jambhekar because it would allow the transcription to be sent to a remote user hence facilitating use.

27. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega in view of Jambhekar and taken in view of Padmanabhan, Damiba and Applicant's admitted prior art.

Ortega, Jambhekar, Padmanabhan and Damiba do not teach the archival device to be a printer.

Applicant's admitted prior art that printers are a well known output device in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Ortega, Jambhekar, Padmanabhan and Damiba to

have the archival device be a printer because it would give a hard copy transcription of the voice message hence facilitating use for the user.

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Zaharlev (U.S. Pat. 6,035,104) teaches a system for forwarding messages to multiple output devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Sked whose telephone number is (571) 272-7627. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MS
03/02/06

DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600